REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are presently pending. Claims 1-17 are amended. Claims 18-23 are added.

Claims 1,7, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,903,311 (Ozcelik). Claim 1 is amended to recite, among other limitations, "writing a second portion of the _progressive_ frame while displaying the first portion of the _progressive_ frame". Claim 7 is amended to recite, among other limitations, "a controller for writing a second portion of the _progressive_ frame in the memory, while the display engine displays the first portion". Claim 15 is amended to recite, among other limitations, a first prediction frame buffer for storing a first _progressive_ frame; a second prediction frame buffer for storing a second _progressive_ frame; and a delta frame buffer for storing a portion of a third _progressive_ frame.

Examiner has indicated that Ozcelik discloses "writing a second portion of the frame while displaying the first portion of the frame (col. 12, ln 19-41; Ozcelik discloses the second portion, ie. <u>bottom field</u>, of the frame is written or buffered for storage while the first portion, ie. <u>top field</u>, is displayed)." Office Action, at 3 (Emphasis Added). However, Assignee respectfully submits that Ozcelik does not teach the limitations of claim 1 as now amended, for example, "writing a second portion of the _progressive_ frame while displaying the first portion of the _progressive_ frame". Similarly, Ozcelik does not teach the limitations of claim 7 as now amended, for example, "a controller for writing a second portion of the _progressive_ frame in the memory, while the display engine displays the first portion".

Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 1, 7, and 15 as well as to dependent claims 2-6 and 8-14, 16, and 17.

Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Assignee has amended claim 13, it respectfully submits that the foregoing rejection is overcome.

Claims 18-22 are added. Claim 18 recites, among other limitations, "a controller for writing a second portion of the field in the memory, while the display engine displays the first portion of the field." Assignee respectfully submits that Ozcelik does not teach the foregoing.

Although Examiner has indicated that Ozcelik discloses "writing a second portion of the frame while displaying the first portion of the frame (col. 12, ln 19-41; Ozcelik discloses the second portion, ie. bottom field, of the frame is written or buffered for storage while the first portion, ie. top field, is displayed)." Office Action, at 3 (Emphasis Added), Assignee respectfully submits that Ozcelik does not teach "a controller for writing a second portion of the field in the memory, while the display engine displays the first portion of the field." It is noted that the limitations, "controller for writing a second portion of the field" and "display engine displays the first portion of the field" refer to the same "field". However, the "top field" and "bottom field" refer to different fields. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner allow claim 15 and dependent claims 16-20.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee submits that each of the pending claims are now in a condition for

9

allowance. Accordingly, Examiner is requested to pass this case to issuance.

It is believed that all monies for the actions described herein are provided with this correspondence. To the extent that additional monies are required for any of the actions requested in the correspondence, Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees and credit any overpayments to deposit account 13-0017.

Respectfully Submitted

August 24, 2007

Mirut Dalal
Attorney for Assignee
Reg. No. 44,052

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison - Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000
FAX   (312) 775-8100